

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 59-79 are pending in the application, with claims 59, 66, and 73 being the independent claims. Claims 48 and 49 are sought to be canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claims 59-79 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

An accompanying information disclosure statement is filed including the Non-Patent Literature Document to *Ashtana et al.* which was inadvertently omitted from the prior filing.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 48 and 49 were objected to due to informality. Claims 48 and 49 have been canceled by the above amendment, rendering the objection moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 48 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,956,683 to Jacobs et al. ("Jacobs") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,943,648 to Tel ("Tel"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection

Claims 48 and 49 have been canceled by the above amendment. Accordingly, the rejection of those claims is not addressed. Newly presented claims 59-79 are not obvious over the combination of Jacobs and Tel. The combination of Jacobs and Tel does not

teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 59, 66, and 73 which is required to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In Jacobs, word decoding functionality is distributed “between handset 100 and base station 110 in the sense that a voice recognition with a relatively small vocabulary size is implemented locally at handset while a second voice recognition system with larger vocabulary size resides remotely at base station.” (Jacobs, col. 8, lines 33-38). If the local word decoder 106 of the handset 100 fails to decode the input word string and determines that the remote voice recognition system should decode it, the handset 100 transmits the extracted features to the remote system for decoding. (Jacobs, col. 9, lines 7-20). Jacobs does not teach or suggest a communication module “operable to detect additional speech input from the user and to cause the remote device to cease provision of the output response to the user,” as recited in newly present claim 59. Jacobs also does not teach or suggest “detecting additional speech input by the user; and transmitting a signal to the remote device to cause the remote device to cease provision of the output response to the user,” as recited in newly presented claims 66 and 73.

Tel does not overcome the deficiencies of Jacobs relative independent claims 59, 66, and 73 described above. Tel describes a speech signal distribution system having a transmitting subsystem and one or more receiving subsystems. Neither the transmitting subsystem nor the receiving subsystem has a communication module “operable to detect additional speech input from the user and to cause the remote device to cease provision of the output response to the user,” as recited in newly present claim 59. Furthermore, Tel does not teach or suggest “detecting additional speech input by the user; and transmitting a signal to the remote device to cause the remote device to cease provision of the output response to the user,” as recited in newly presented claims 66 and 73.

For at least the above reasons, newly presented claims 59, 66, and 73 are patentable over Jacobs alone or in combination with Tel. Claims 60-65 depend from claim 59; claims 67-72 depend from claim 66; and claims 74-79 depend from claim 73. For at least these reasons and further in view of their own features, dependent claims 60-65, 67-72, and 74-79 are patentable over Jacobs alone or in combination with Tel.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Lori A. Gordon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 50,633

Date: June 5, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600